



*Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the R & R to which specific objections are made, and it may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No party has filed objections to the R & R. In the absence of objections to the R & R, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 72] of the Magistrate Judge. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Unum's [ECF No. 22] motion is **GRANTED IN ITS ENTIRETY** as follows:

- (1) Unum shall **DEPOSIT** the insurance policy proceeds (the \$165,000 Stake, plus the interest accruing from the date of the decedent's death until the date the deposit is made) into the Court's registry. After depositing the proceeds, Unum shall be **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE** from this action.
- (2) Unum shall be **AWARDED** attorney's fees in the amount of \$2,464.13, which is to be deducted from the Stake and paid to Unum *when the final judgment in this case is entered*.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Florence, South Carolina  
January 22, 2016

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge